1	Michael Vertkin 1982 Sobre Vista Road Sonoma, CA 95476	
3	Phone 415-203-1116 Fax 707-938-3844 E-mail hippobegemot@hughes.net Defendant Michael Vertkin, <i>Pro se</i>	
4		
5		
6	United States District Court	
7 8	Northern District of California	
9) Case No.: C 07 4471 SC
10	Dr. Anna Vertkin,) Defendant's/Counter-Claimant's
11	Plaintiff, Counter-Defendant	MICHAEL VERTKIN REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S
	VS.	DR. VERTKIN OPPOSITION TO REQUEST FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT FOR FAILURE TO
12	Michael Vertkin, and Does 1-20.	ANSWER COUNTER- CLAIM AND AFFIRMATIVE
13	Defendants Counter Claiment	DEFENSES. FRCIV.P. 55(A)
14	Defendants, Counter-Claimant	<u>)</u>
15		
16		
17	REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO ENTRY OF DEFAULT	
18		
19	COME NOW the Defendant/Counter Claimant, Michael Vertkin, Pro Se and replies to	
20	Plaintiff's/ Counter Defendant's, Dr. Anna Vertkin opposition to default entry request.	
21	First, answer to the counter claim was due on February 27, 2008.	
22	When a party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead or otherwise defend, and that failure is shown by affidavit or otherwise, the clerk must enter the party's default. FRCiv.P.55 (a) (emphasis added)	
23		
24	Second, Hon. Judge Conti postponed Case Management Conference until April 25, 2008,	
25	not responsive pleadings. In fact, on February 6, 2008 Plaintiff demanded in an e-mail, that	

Defendant file an answer to the complaint, three days before it was due and threatened that the default request will be filed against Defendant if answer is not filed next day (**Exhibit A**)

Third, Defendant did extend professional courtesy to the Plaintiff and send letter on March 5, 2008 (that's a week after responsive pleading was due), with the request file an answer (**Exhibit B**). Nether plaintiff or her counsel called back, e-mailed, wrote or otherwise responded to the request, it was simply ignored.

Fourth, Defendant find Plaintiff's claim that she was unaware of the Counter Claim not credible. Heading of the responsive pleading clearly designated it as Answer, Affirmative Defenses and COUNTER CLAIM. Defendant confirmed at ECF site that he was filing Counter Claim with the answer to the complaint. ECF clearly designated it as Counter Claim. New titles were assigned by ECF to Dr. Vertkin—counter defendant and Michael Vertkin—counter claimant (Exhibit C). It would be impossible to miss the fact that counter claim was filed. As for Plaintiff's allegation that counter claim being "buried" behind the answer and affirmative defenses, that is natural and usual order of the pleadings. I hope Plaintiff does not suggest that she reads only first few pages of the pleadings. Specially, pleadings she demanded to enter before they were due.

Fifth, as early as October of 2007, in a letter to plaintiff counsel, Defendant altered him that affirmative defenses and counter claim will be filed with the answer to the complaint.

Plaintiff can not claim that she was "ambushed" with affirmative defenses and counter claim.

The letter is somewhat of the personal nature and Defendant hesitant to exhibit it without opposing counsel consent, but he will if Plaintiff insists or upon the Court's request.

And lastly, Defendant find highly offensive Plaintiff's statement that Defendant's being litigant *pro se* is an "advantage". On the contrary, it is Plaintiff who knowing that the Defendant is *pro se* litigant, has simply ignored her obligation to answer counter claim and affirmative defenses. There is no advantage whatsoever for Defendant, a lay person, to have no alternative,

but to spend countless hours struggling through the Federal Code and spend nights with the
Local Rules. Meanwhile Plaintiff, having retained most of the community funds, uses hundreds
of thousands of dollars in her possession to prosecute him in three different Courts to gain an
advantage in the divorce proceedings, harass the Defendant and put him further in debt.

In summary, Plaintiff /Counter- Defendant knew that counter claim was filed, was alerted
that the answer to counter claim and affirmative defenses were overdue, but chose simply to

that the answer to counter claim and affirmative defenses were overdue, but chose simply to ignore Defendant's request, Federal Code and Court Rules. Plaintiff showed no good cause in the opposition to entry of the default. Therefore, Defendant respectfully requests an entry of the default against Plaintiff / Counter – Defendant, Dr. Anna Vertkin.

Respectfully submitted

191 Michael Fortkin

Michael Vertkin, defendant/counterclaimant, pro se

Vertkin v. Vertkin

From: Robert Shepard [sheplaw@yahoo.com] Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2008 3:35 PM To: Michael Vertkin

Subject: Vertkin v. Vertkin

Mr. Vertkin, your answer to the complaint filed was due yesterday, 5/5/2008. Please file your answer by tomorrow, 5/7/2008, or on Friday, 5/8/2008, I will request that the court enter a default against you. Robert Shepard

The Law Office of Robert L. Shepard 760 Market Street, Suite 706
San Francisco, California 94102-2307
(415) 951-8234 Voice
(415) 951-8233 Fax sheplaw@yahoo.com www.shepardestateplanning.com

Be a better friend, newshound, and know-it-all with Yahoo! Mobile. Try it now.

Exhibit B

MICHAEL VERTKIN

1982 SOBRE VISTA RD. SONOMA, CA 95476 TELEPHONE (415) 203-1116 FAX (707) 938-3844

March 3, 2008

Robert L. Shepard The Law Office of Robert L. Shepard 760 Market Street, Suite #706 San Francisco, California 94102-2307

Re: Case No.: C 07 4471 SC Answer to counter claim

Dear Sir,

Your answer to counter claim and reply to affirmative defenses was due on February 27.2008. To date none was filed. I will ask court to enter default against your client if answer not filed by March 9, 2008.

Sincerely

Michael Vertkin

Exhibit C

Motions

3:07-cv-04471-SC Vertkin v. Vertkin

ADRMOP, E-Filing, ENE, ProSe

Select the filer.

Select the Party:

Vertkin, Anna [Plaintiff]
Vertkin, Anna [Counter-defendant]
Vertkin, Michael [Defendant]
Vertkin, Michael [Counter-claimant]

Add/Create New Party

SUBMIT

Clear